

Standard Findings and Guidelines for Team Accreditation Recommendations

Professional Services Division

August 2008

Overview of this Report

At the May 2008, COA meeting, the Committee adopted the following Accreditation Decision Options for use beginning with the 2008-09 Site Visits:

- Accreditation
- Accreditation with Stipulations
- Accreditation with Major Stipulations
- Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations
- Denial of Accreditation

In addition, the Committee reflected on their discussions and decision-making processes for adopting accreditation decisions, including stipulations, during the 2007-08 year.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item.

Background

At the May 2008 COA meeting, the Committee took action to adopt the 5 Accreditation Decision Options listed above. In addition, the Committee adopted possible institution actions that would be required following each accreditation decision (Table 1). Operational Implication statements relating to each of the action options is attached in Appendix A. If the COA could review the Operational Implications during the August 2008 meeting and provide feedback to staff, it would assist in the development of the Accreditation Handbook.

Table 1: Accreditation Decisions and Consequent Institution Activities

Institution Actions Following an Accreditation Site Visit	Accreditation				Denial of Accreditation
	Accreditation	with Stipulations	with Major Stipulations	with Probationary Stipulations	
No required follow-up beyond the routine accreditation activities, i.e. Biennial Reports and Program Assessment.	✓				
Submit 7th Year Follow-up Report addressing all identified area(s) of concern and/or questions.	✓				
Submit 7th Year Follow-up Report addressing all stipulation(s), identified area(s) of concern and/or questions..		✓	✓	✓	
Submit periodic Follow-up Reports (30 days, 90 days, as determined by the COA) to ensure that appropriate action is being			✓	✓	

Institution Actions Following an Accreditation Site Visit	Accreditation				Denial of Accreditation
	Accreditation	with Stipulations	with Major Stipulations	with Probationary Stipulations	
taken in a timely manner.					
Report on the stipulation(s) through the next accreditation cycle's activities.			✓	✓	
Re-visit by Commission staff and team leader.		✓	✓	✓	
Re-visit by Commission staff, team leader, and 1 or more team members.			✓	✓	
Institution must notify all current and prospective candidates of the institution's accreditation status.				✓	
Institution is prohibited from accepting new candidates in one or more programs until the stipulation(s) has been met.				✓	
Institution is prohibited from proposing new programs until the stipulation has been met.				✓	
Institution must take immediate steps to close all credential programs.					✓

✓ Suggested follow-up activity

✓ Possible follow up activity

COA Discussion on Guidance for the Team Recommendation

The site visit team's recommendation for an Accreditation Decision is a holistic decision based on the Common Standard findings, and on the number and severity of "Met with Concerns" or "Not Met" findings for the specific programs offered at the institution. The COA's discussion at the June 2008, meeting indicated that it might be helpful to provide consultants and site visit teams guidance about the type of accreditation decisions the COA might make based on the type and number of standards that are less than fully met.

The COA makes one accreditation decision for the institution and all of its approved educator preparation programs. This accreditation decision reflects to a great degree the team's findings on the Common Standards. If one or more programs have significant issues, these issues usually rise to the level of one or more Common Standards being 'Met with Concerns' or 'Not Met.'

The table presented on the next page is for the Committee's discussion. The table is an attempt to provide some guidance to site visit teams for when a specific accreditation decision might be made by the Committee, and therefore recommended by the team. To provide historical context, Appendix B displays the fourteen site visit team accreditation recommendations, COA accreditation decisions, a summary of the Common Standards findings and a summary of the Program Standard Findings.

When teams are deliberating to make the accreditation recommendation, they must consider the findings on the Common Standards, as well as the number and severity of standards found to be less than fully met for the programs offered by the institution. If an institution has very few, to no, program standards found to be ‘Met with Concerns’ or ‘Not Met,’ then the accreditation recommendation would most likely be towards the left hand side of the options identified in Table 2, below. If on the other hand, there are a number of program standards found to be “Met with Concerns’ or ‘Not Met,’ then the team’s accreditation recommendation would most likely be in the middle or towards the right hand side of the range identified below.

Clearly, the number of educator preparation programs an institution offers must be taken into account when considering the impact of program standards on an accreditation recommendation. If an institution offers a small number of programs, then a smaller number of program standards found to be less than fully met is significant. On the other hand, if an institution offers a large number of programs, then a few program standards found to be less than fully met might not be as significant.

Table 2: General Guidance for Initial Site Visit Team Recommendation*

Common Standards Less than Fully Met		Accreditation				Denial of Accreditation
# Met with Concerns	# Not Met	Accreditation	with Stipulations	with Major Stipulations	with Probationary Stipulations	
0	0	•				Not a recommendation for an initial site visit. The recommendation of ‘Denial of Accreditation’ is appropriate after a Revisit.
1-2	0	●————●				
1-2	1-2		●————●			
1-2	3-4			●————●		
3-4	0	●————●				
3-4	1-2		●————●			
3-4	3-4			●————●		
3-4	5+				•	
5+	0-2		●————●			
5+	3+				•	

* Findings on Program Standards must be considered by the team in making the accreditation recommendation

Next Steps

Based on the COA’s discussion, staff may draft language for the Accreditation Handbook related to guidance for the accreditation teams’ deliberations, decision-making, and recommendations. The draft language would be presented at the October COA meeting for the Committee’s discussion. If the Committee directs, the revised language would return to the January COA meeting for possible adoption.

Appendix A

Definitions of Accreditation Decision Options and Operational Implications

Accreditation

The recommendation of ***Accreditation*** means that the accreditation team verified that the institution and its programs, when judged as a whole, met or exceeded the Commission's adopted Common Standards and the Program Standards selected by the institution pursuant to the options listed in the Accreditation Framework. The institution (including its credential programs) is judged to be effective in preparing educators and is demonstrating overall quality in its programs and general operations. The status of Accreditation can be achieved even if there are one or two Common standards identified as "met with concerns" or one or more areas of concern are identified within its credential programs.

Operational Implications

An institution that receives the status of ***Accreditation*** is permitted to continue all accredited credential programs and to propose new credential programs to the Committee on Accreditation at any time. The COA may require follow-up related to concerns identified in the accreditation site visit. The institution is required to participate in the accreditation activities required of its assigned cohort, which are Biennial Reports, Program Assessment and Site Visits. The institution is required to abide by all Commission and state regulations. The institution may indicate in all publications and documents that it is accredited and the Committee on Accreditation will note its status in the Committee's annual report to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation with Stipulations

The recommendation of ***Accreditation with Stipulations*** means that the accreditation team verified that the institution and some of its programs has "not met" or "met with concerns" some Common Standards or Program Standards. The institution is judged to be generally effective in preparing educators and in its general operations apart from the identified areas of concern. The concerns or problems identified are confined to specific issues that do not impact the quality of the program received by candidates or completers.

Operational Implications

An institution that receives the status of ***Accreditation with Stipulations*** is permitted to continue all accredited credential programs and to propose new credential programs to the Committee on Accreditation at any time. The institution is required to participate in the accreditation activities required of its assigned cohort, which are Biennial Reports, Program Assessment and Site Visits. The institution is required to respond to all stipulations noted by the Committee on Accreditation and to prepare a written report with appropriate documentation that indicates how all stipulations have been addressed. This report is sent to the Committee on Accreditation within one calendar year of the visit. The Committee on Accreditation may ask the accreditation team chair or a Commission consultant to verify the accuracy and completeness of the institution's response. A re-visit can, but is not typically, made by the team lead or Commission consultant. Once the stipulation(s) have been adequately addressed, a recommendation stating that the stipulations should be removed will be made to the Committee on Accreditation. Once the recommendation is accepted the institution is notified that stipulations have been removed. The institution is then given the status of Accredited. The institution is required to abide by all Commission and state regulations. The institution may indicate in all publications and

documents that it is accredited and the Committee on Accreditation will note its status in the Committee's annual report to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation with Major Stipulations

The recommendation of ***Accreditation with Major Stipulations*** indicates that an accreditation team found that the institution has multiple standards in the Common Standards and/or Program Standards that are “not met,” or “met with concerns,” or the team found areas of concern that are likely to impact the preparation of credential program candidates such as matters of curriculum, field experience, or candidate competence. The team may have identified other issues that impinge on the ability of the institution to deliver programs of quality and effectiveness. The institution is judged to be providing quality programs and to be effective in preparing educators in some of its credential programs and in its general operations, but these areas of quality do not outweigh the identified areas of concern.

The recommendation of ***Accreditation with Major Stipulations*** indicates that an accreditation team identified serious deficiencies in how the institution responded to the Common Standards and Program Standards, or the team found areas of concern that impact the preparation of credential program candidates such as matters of curriculum, field experience, or candidate competence. The team may have identified other issues that prevent the institution from delivering high quality, effective programs. The institution may be judged to be providing quality programs in some of its credential programs and in its general operations, but these areas of quality do not outweigh the identified areas of concern. A probationary stipulation may require that a severely deficient program be discontinued.

Operational Implications

An institution receiving a recommendation of ***Accreditation with Major Stipulations*** is permitted to continue all approved credential programs. The institution is required to participate in the accreditation activities as required of its assigned cohort, which are Biennial Reports, Program Assessment and Site Visits. The institution is required to respond to all stipulations noted by the Committee on Accreditation by preparing a written report with appropriate documentation demonstrating that all stipulations have been addressed and/or to prepare for a focused re-visit by the team lead and consultant, and/or members of the accreditation team. The institution will work with its Commission consultant to plan the re-visit that will address the stated concerns identified by the original accreditation team. The Institution is required to respond to all stipulations imposed by the Committee on Accreditation by preparing a written report with appropriate documentation demonstrating that all stipulations have been addressed and to prepare for a focused re-visit by an accreditation team. The report of the re-visit team will be submitted to, and acted upon by, the Committee on Accreditation within one calendar year of the original visit.

Once all stipulations have been removed, the institution is granted accreditation and is permitted to continue all accredited credential programs and to propose new credential programs to the Committee on Accreditation at any time. The institution will notify its constituency of its change of accreditation status as it sees fit. The institution is required to abide by all Commission and state regulations. The institution may indicate in all publications and documents its accreditation

status (which is, initially, Accreditation with Major Stipulations, and then, if stipulations are met, Accreditation) and the Committee on Accreditation will note its status in the Committee's annual report to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations

The recommendation of ***Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations*** indicates that an accreditation team identified serious deficiencies in the way an institution responded to the Common Standards and Program Standards, or the team found areas of concern that impact the preparation of credential program candidates such as matters of curriculum, field experience, or candidate competence. The team may have identified other issues that prevent the institution from delivering high quality, effective programs. The team may have found that the institution delivers quality programs and is effective in preparing educators in some of its credential programs and in its general operations, but these areas of quality do not outweigh the identified areas of concern.

Operational Implications

An institution receiving a recommendation of ***Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations*** is permitted to continue all accredited credential programs for a period of one calendar year. The institution is required to participate in the accreditation activities as required of its assigned cohort, which are Biennial Reports, Program Assessment and Site Visits. The Institution may not propose new programs of professional preparation or expand existing programs. Limitations may be placed on affected programs. The Institution may be required to notify students of its accreditation status. The notification could be limited to students in a particular program or could apply to all students. In addition, the institution may be required to submit an action plan describing its plan to address the stipulations and provide updates at specified intervals. The Institution is required to respond to all stipulations imposed by the Committee on Accreditation by preparing a written report with appropriate documentation demonstrating that all stipulations have been addressed and to prepare for a focused re-visit by an accreditation team. The Institution will work with the original consultant to plan the re-visit that will address the concerns identified by the original accreditation team. The report of the re-visit team will be submitted, reviewed, and acted upon by the Committee on Accreditation within one calendar year of the original visit.

The institution is required to abide by all Commission and state regulations. The Committee on Accreditation will note its status in the Committee's annual report to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. If all stipulations are removed within the year, the institution is granted accreditation and is permitted to continue all accredited credential programs and to propose new credential programs to the Committee on Accreditation at any time. On some occasions significant progress may have been made, but additional time is needed to remedy the identified deficiencies identified. If this is the case, the Committee on Accreditation may continue stipulations or adopt revised stipulations. The COA would also specify the amount of additional time the institution has to address the remaining stipulations.. In the event that the institution does not respond appropriately to the stipulations according to the timeline, the institution will be brought back to the Committee on Accreditation for consideration of Denial of Accreditation.

Revisit Procedures

The institution must address all stipulations in a

The institution will work with its Commission consultant to plan the re-visit that will address the stipulations placed upon the institution by the COA. The Institution is required to respond to all stipulations imposed by the Committee on Accreditation by preparing a written report with appropriate documentation demonstrating that all stipulations have been addressed and to prepare for a focused re-visit by an accreditation team. The report of the re-visit team will be submitted to, and acted upon by, the Committee on Accreditation within one calendar year of the original visit.

Denial of Accreditation

If an accreditation team is conducting a re-visit to an institution that received **major** or probationary stipulations as a result of a previous accreditation visit and the re-visit team finds that the stipulations have not been adequately addressed or remediated, the re-visit team must, report the fact that the stipulations have not been adequately addressed to the COA. The COA may vote to Deny Accreditation or may, if requested by the institution, permit an additional period to remedy severe deficiencies if the Committee finds that (a) substantial progress has been and/or (b) special circumstances described by the institution justify a delay.

Operational Implications

An institution receiving ***Denial of Accreditation*** would be required to take immediate steps to close all credential programs at the end of the semester or quarter in which the Committee on Accreditation decision took place. The institution would be required to file a plan of discontinuation within 90 days of the Committee's decision. The plan would give information and assurances regarding the institution's efforts to place currently enrolled students in other programs or to provide adequate assistance to permit students to complete their particular program.

The institution will be required to announce that it has had its accreditation for educator preparation withdrawn. The institution would be enjoined from re-applying for institutional approval for a minimum of two years. If the institution were to wish to provide educator preparation programs at a future date, it would be required to make a formal application to the Commission which would include the submission of a complete self study report including responses to the Preconditions, Common Standards and Program Standards. The self-study must show clearly how the institution attended to all problems noted in the accreditation team re-visit report that resulted in Denial of Accreditation. The Commission would make a decision on the status of the institution. If the Commission grants initial institutional approval to the institution, the Committee on Accreditation would review and, if appropriate, approve its programs. An accreditation site visit would be scheduled within two years to ensure the newly approved programs adhered to the Common and Program Standards.

Appendix B

2007-08 Accreditation Site Visits		Findings on				Total Number of Approved Programs
		Common Standards		Program Standards		
Team Recommendation	Accreditation Decision	Met with Concerns	Not Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met	
Accreditation	Accreditation	0	0	0	0	2
Accreditation	Accreditation	0	0	0*	0*	17
Accreditation	Accreditation	0	0	0	0	9
Accreditation	Accreditation	0	0	0	0	2
Accreditation	Accreditation	0	0	3	0	4
Accreditation	Accreditation	1	0	2	0	2
Accreditation	Accreditation	1	0	6	0	12
Stipulations	Substantive Stipulations	2	0	8	7	3
Stipulations	Stipulations	4	0	1	0	3
Stipulations	Stipulations	1	1	1	1	2
Substantive Stipulations	Substantive Stipulations	1	1	10	2	4
Substantive Stipulations	Substantive Stipulations	4	1	8	5	3
Substantive Stipulations	Probationary Stipulations	7	0	0	8	2
Probationary Stipulations	Probationary Stipulations	3	1	49	9	4

* One program did not provide sufficient evidence to have standard decisions made by the site visit team